

PATENT
App. Ser. No.: 09/592,308
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000014US1
PS Ref. No.: IBM2K0014

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated October 17, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on January 17, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 12-13, 15-18, 21-22 and 24-30 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 12-13, 15-18, 21-22 and 24-30 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 3, 8, 12, 17, 21 and 26 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4, 6-8, 12-13, 15-17, 21-22, 24-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Travis*, US 5,604,897 patented 2/18/1997 in view of *Fein et al.* (hereinafter "Fein"), US 5,940,847 filed 1/31/1997 and *Rogson*, US 6,918,086 filed 3/28/2000.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criteria.

The Examiner takes the position that *Rogson* teaches:

"assigning a formatting definition to each problem word for use in identifying problem words on a display device, wherein the formatting definition to each problem word for use in identifying problem words on a display device, wherein the formatting definition is reflective, on a display device displaying the respective problem word, of the number of times the respective problem word has been replaced by its associated replacement word and indicating each problem word present a second document with

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 09/592,308
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC92000014US1
PS Ref. No.: IBM2K0014

its respective formatting definition in fig. 5, 8, 10, 11, col. 2 lines 18-35, col. 3 line 11 - col. 4 line 25, and col. 5 lines 31-64."

Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of *Rogson* cited by the Examiner, and the cited references taken either alone or in combination, do not teach, show or suggest any relationship between a displayed format of a problem word with the number of times the word has been misspelled. Moreover, merely one displayed format for the problem words is shown (e.g., Figures 6 and 7 of *Rogson*).

Furthermore, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach, show or suggest assigning a priority value (i.e., not merely a count) to each problem word based on the number of times a respective problem word has been replaced by its associated replacement word. Also, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach, show or suggest that the formatting definition is based on the priority value, and further, that the problem words assigned with the same priority value are assigned the same formatting definition and wherein the problems words assigned with different priority values are displayed with respectively different visual distinguishable formats in the second document.

Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose such features and that the Examiner has taken unreasonably broad interpretations of the references and simply made conclusory statements that these features are taught by the references. The Examiner is invited to identify more succinctly the portions of the references that disclose the claimed features discussed herein.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 18, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Travis* in view of *Fein* and *Rogson*, as applied to claims 8, 17, and 26 above, and further in view of *Cal et al.* (hereinafter "*Cal*"), US 6,175,834 B1 filed 06/24/1998. In view of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

PATENT

App. Ser. No.: 09/592,308
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000014US1
PS Ref. No.: IBM2K0014

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph M. Jong
Registration No. 42,698
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)